

REMARKS

Claims 1, 14-15 and 35-36 have been amended. Claim 33 has been canceled to overcome the Examiner's objection that claims 33 and 34 are duplicate claims. Claims 1-8, 10-15 and 34-36 are presently pending.

The Examiner is thanked for the courtesies extended during the telephonic Examiner interview conducted on October 20, 2004.

In view of the amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims, as presently presented, are respectfully requested.

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Claims 1-4 and 33-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Takenouchi *et al.*; claims 1, 9-10, 14-15 and 35-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Montpas; and claims 1, 5-6 and 35-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bosserman *et al.* In addition, claims 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Bosserman *et al.* in view of Riches; claims 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Montpas in view of Dirscherl *et al.*; and claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Montpas in view of Riches. Claims 1, 14-15 and 35-36 as amended, and claims 2-8, 10-13 and 34 which depend directly or indirectly upon claims 1, 14 or 15, clearly are patentable over the cited references.

In accordance with the discussions conducted during the telephonic Examiner interview, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the inventive imaging arrangement is adapted to receive two dimensional optical data "representative of an object" and represented by at least two beams of electromagnetic radiation, and that the

arrangement includes a means for gating and converting the at least two beams into image data that is arranged to provide "an image including the object in its entirety" to each respective independently-gatable portion of a photosensitive surface. Support for this claim amendment is found in the specification at, for example, page 2, lines 10-12, and also at page 7, paragraph 8 and in Figures 1 and 2, which describe and show that a beam splitter can provide four identical images of the object OB to each of the gatable portions GP1, GP2, GP3 and GP4. As discussed in the previously filed Amendment, the subject invention involves use of a beam splitter to cause an incident beam to split so as to reproduce an image including an object in its entirety, and provides the image including the object in its entirety to each respective portion of a photosensitive surface as required by claim 1.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Takenouchi *et al.* discloses an arrangement that scans each line of a document as a separate image, *i.e.*, the document is scanned piece by piece, where the scanning information for each line is multiplexed for recreating the document being scanned. Nowhere do Takenouchi *et al.* teach or suggest a means for gating and converting at least two beams into image data, where the two beams represent optical data representative of an object, and where the means for gating and converting is arranged "to provide an image including the object in its entirety to each respective portion of the photosensitive surface" as required by claim 1.

Also in contrast to the claimed invention, Montpas discloses dividing a light beam into quadrants using four reflective facets of a suitably oriented pyramid, and then directing each divided light beam onto one of four photosensitive surfaces. (See Montpas Col. 2, lines 41-61). The dividing of the beam by the pyramid in Montpas

provides that a portion of an image of an object is directed to a photosensitive surface, such that the image received by the photosensitive surface does not contain the entirety of the object of which optical data received by the imaging arrangement is representative. Thus, Montpas does not disclose or suggest providing an image including the object in its entirety to respective portions of a photosensitive surface, as required by claim 1.

As to Bosserman *et al.*, although Bosserman *et al.* concerns an imaging arrangement where a photo cathode array comprises a plurality of pixels, the pixels in Bosserman *et al.* do not receive the entirety of the object of which the received optical data is representative and there is no teaching of "a means for gating and converting the at least two beams into image data [which] is arranged to provide an image including the object in its entirety to each respective portion of the photosensitive surface", as required by claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over each of Takenouchi *et al.*, Montpas and Bosserman *et al.*

Claims 14-15 and 35-36 have been amended to conform to the amendments made to claim 1. Claims 14-15, in relevant part, recite that the claimed imaging arrangement, which is adapted to receive two dimensional optical data representative of an object and represented by an incident beam, provides that each of a plurality of beams into which the incident beam is split corresponds to "an image including the object in its entirety". Claims 35-36, in relevant part, recite that the claimed imaging arrangement, which is adapted to receive a plurality of images representative of an object, provides that each respective portion of a photosensitive surface is arranged to

gate "an image including the object in its entirety". Therefore, claims 14-15 and 35-36 are also patentable over the cited references for the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable, as set forth above.

Further, claims 2-8, 10-13 and 34, which depend directly or indirectly upon independent claims 1, 14 or 15, are also patentable for the same reasons that the independent claims from which they depend are patentable, as set forth above, and because of the additional restrictions they recite.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the Section 102 and 103 rejections of the claims.


CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all of the claims, as presently presented, are patentable.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if it is believed that further amendment and/or discussion would help to advance the prosecution of the present application.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-8, 10-15 and 34-36 are, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Davy E. Zeneraich
Registration Number 37,267

NORRIS, McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS
P.O. Box 1018
Somerville, New Jersey 08876-1018
Phone: (908) 722-0700; Fax: (908) 722-0755
E-Mail: ipdept@nmmlaw.com
Attorney Docket No. 20776-215US